



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

more searching questions. Lastly, a special and supplementary examination will be set in both cases to test the student's knowledge of subject matter, antiquities, and, in the honor examination, of his literary appreciation.

These remarks are offered for what they are worth in the hope of provoking an exhaustive discussion of Dr. Maxwell's startlingly revolutionary proposals. Vivant sequentes!

ERNST RIESS.

THE STRUCTURE OF CICERO'S ORATIO PRO LEGE MANILIA¹

In this speech, as is well known, Cicero used all the technical devices of rhetoric taught by the Greek and the Roman theorists. As an example of argumentative oratory it is notable, not only in classical, but in all literature. An analysis of it will disclose the means by which its structure has been wrought out, and will suggest comparison with other pieces of argumentation. The American schoolboy while reading this speech will gain practical help by carrying the results of his work upon it over into his study of, say, Burke's Conciliation with America. Similarities and contrasts will constantly inspire the student who carefully handles specimens of oratory in the two languages.

Suggestive exercises can be planned also for comparison with the other speeches of Cicero. Standing as the preeminent example of its type, the *genus deliberativum* or argumentative oratory, the Manilian Law invites comparison as a whole and for literary finish with his best speeches of the other two types; for example, with the Second Philippic, the *genus laudativum* or personal oratory of eulogy and invective and with certain of the speeches against Verres, the *genus iudiciale* or legal oratory.

The care with which the structure has been elaborated is a natural result of Cicero's theory, which he announced in his early work, *De Inventione* I. 33. In this treatise, belonging perhaps to the year 84 B. C., he lays down the rule that the division of a subject (*partitio*) and the discussion of it (*tractatio*) should follow the same order. Indeed, this doctrine became a commonplace of Roman rhetoric and is stated with even more emphasis by Quintilian 4, 5-28.

Cicero gives a decided and full *partitio* in only seven of his speeches: *Pro Quinctio* (81 B. C.), *Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* (80), *In Verrem, Actio 2*, 3 *De Frumeto* (70), *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* (66), *Pro Cluentio* (66), *Pro Murena* (63), *Philippica 7* (43). These dates are of interest for the development of Cicero's art and as related to his earliest rhetorical theories published in his *De Inventione* (84 B. C.?). In no other speech, however, is the structure so carefully elaborated as in the Manilian Law. A brief statement and the outline at the end of this article will serve to show the pains

Cicero bestowed upon the mere mechanics of structure in this particular speech.

After a short introduction, dealing with his previous career and his present opportunity, Cicero foreshadows the goal of his entire speech in 3. He next puts vividly before his hearers the present grave crisis in Asia Minor. He starts his positive argument by an appeal to meet this crisis intelligently, dividing this part of his speech into three heads and dividing the first further into four subheads.

He then proceeds (7) to discuss these divisions in due order. When he reaches the third point, he has come to the heart of his proposition (27), the choice of a commander to meet the crisis. After a preliminary statement to show the inevitableness of choosing Pompey (27; cf. 3 as enhanced by this second insistence on Pompey), a discussion of the ideal qualities of a commander (a sort of *locus communis*) is begun (28) by dividing the subject into four heads. In the treatment of these four topics the general aspect and the specific illustration from Pompey's career go hand in hand; the discussion is not purely academic. In 29 Cicero has reached another important stage in the course of his argument; *virtus* in all its phases and its manifold values is necessary to cope with the enemies of the Republic. How Pompey meets these requirements is viewed from two aspects; he is considered as a general and as a man. His merits as a general are illustrated in 29-35 by a series of striking scenes, which put before us Pompey's strenuous career for the previous twenty years.

Another *partitio* occurs in exhibiting Pompey's noble traits of personality. Naturally this is the most complicated passage in the speech. This is evidently meant as a genuine *partitio*: note *primum*, *deinde*, and the discussion which corresponds, beginning with 37. But the order of discussion is unexpectedly not the order of division: the topic *fides*, fidelity, is out of its place, either in 36 or in 42.

After closing the discussion of Pompey's merits and excellences as a man, Cicero deals with the two remaining topics under choosing a commander: *auctoritas*, prestige (43), and *felicitas*, success (47). The whole of the positive argument, *confirmatio*, is closed by a summary, in which Cicero drives home with enhanced force the statements of 3 and 27 by reminding his audience of the steps by which they had unfaithfully come to the one conclusion possible. The argument in rebuttal (51) and the final appeal and summary (60) easily and consistently round out the speech.

Thus the framework and the joints of the speech are clearly evident. But one other feature of Cicero's handling must be noticed—the use of connecting phrases, *transitio*. Cicero pays heed to this linking process in his *Pro Murena* and his *Philippica 7*, as well as in the Manilian Law. But in the elab-

¹ See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4, 202.

C. K.

orate use of this rhetorical device the Manilian Law stands out prominently again. Each *transitio* is a summary of the preceding matter, indicating in this way the conclusion of one point and readiness for another. The *transitio* is a sort of obverse *partitio*. See 19, 27, 28, 36, 46, 48, 49, where transitional sentences weld the joints together; note especially 19, 49.

The analytical outline here subjoined will serve as a practical guide in following the structure of this

speech, so finely knit together and so faultlessly developed in general. It will also enable the reader better to appreciate the means Cicero employed in leading his hearers from point to point and in keeping them constantly reminded of the various arguments clustered about his central theme. And it will show in high relief the one flaw thus discovered in the structure of the oration, the misplacement of the topic *fides*, in 36 or 42. To remedy this flaw is another story.

CICERO, DE IMPERIO CN. POMPEI

FORMA ORATIONIS

I. **Exordium** (1-3).

1. Principium (1-2): (a) Antea, (b) Nunc.
2. Propositio (3): Dicendum est de Cn. Pompei singulari eximiaque virtute.

II. **Narratio** (4-5): Bellum grave et periculosum adfertur.III. **Confirmatio** (6-50).

Partitio (6):

1. De genere belli,

2. De magnitudine belli,

3. De imperatore deligendo.

De genere belli:

- (a) Agitur gloria,
- (b) Agitur salus,
- (c) Aguntur vestigalia,
- (d) Aguntur bonacivium.

Tractatio (7-50):

1. De genere belli (7-19)

(a) Agitur gloria

(7-12),

(b) Agitur salus

(12-13),

(c) Aguntur vecti-

galia (14-16),

(d) Aguntur bona-

civium (17-19).

2. De magnitudine

belli (20-27).

3. De imperatore de-

ligendo (27-50).

A. Unus vir est (27).

Partitio (28):

- (a) Scientia,
- (b) Virtus,
- (c) Auctoritas,
- (d) Felicitas.

Tractatio (28-50):

- (a) Scientia (28),
- (b) Virtus (29-42).

Partitio (29):

- (1) Neque solae vir-
- tutes imperatoriae,
- (2) *Implied in* neque
- solae.

Tractatio (29-42):

- (1) Virtutes impera-
- toriae (29-35):
- Labor, fortitudo,
- industria, celeritas,
- consilium,
- (2) Virtutes ceterae
- (36-42).

Partitio (36):

- (1²) Innocentia,
- (2²) Temperantia,
- (3²) Fides,
- (4²) Facilitas,

(c) Auctoritas (43-

46).

(d) Felicitas (47-

48).

B. Conclusio confir-

mationis (49-50).

Tractatio (37-42):

- (1²) Innocen-
- tia (37-39),
- (2²) Temperantia
- (40-41),
- (3²) Facilitas
- (41),
- (4²) Consilium,
- dicendi gravitas
- et copia=in-
- genium (42),
- (5²) Fides (42),
- (6²) Humanitas
- (42).

- (5²) Ingenium,
- (6²) Humanitas.

IV. Refutatio (51-68).

Partitio (51):	Tractatio (52-68):
1. Ipsa res ac ratio:	1. Ipsa res ac ratio
(a), (b)	sententias refutant
2. Auctoritates con-	(52-68)
trariae.	(a) Hortensi (52-
	58),
	(b) Catuli (59-
	68).
	2. Auctoritates con-
	trariae (68): Ser-
	vilius, Curio, Len-
	tulus, Cassius.

V. Peroratio (69-71).

GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS, Nashville, Tennessee.

CHARLES E. LITTLE.

THE TEACHING OF LATIN COMPOSITION IN COLLEGE

The failures in college entrance examinations in translation from English into Latin, disheartening as they are, may be accounted for in part by the real difficulties of mastering one's first inflected language and by the crowded preparatory curriculum; they do not all indicate poor teachers, indifferent pupils, or unreasonable examiners. But what saving explanations can be given of the Latin which is written by the students who not only have passed these decimating tests but have also continued Latin in college? If these picked few, after seven or eight years' study of the language, do not express themselves in it with a fair degree of ease and correctness, can we feel much confidence in their ability to teach it to our future freshmen or in their own appreciation of its literature? The question of elective composition in college and university is therefore one of the highest importance for all who believe in classical studies¹.

I am not advocating prose composition for its own sake in either school or college, though it can be made a most valuable means of mental discipline, neither would I exalt linguistics at the expense of literary study. Much writing seems to me, however, the most efficient means of acquiring and retaining that exact, unhesitating knowledge of the mechanism of a language without which subsequent study, either linguistic or literary, is slow and dangerous.

The colleges have done something by insisting on translation into Latin in the preparatory schools and, generally, in the freshman year. They also provide one or more elective courses which are required for honors or a recommendation to teach. They fail, in my opinion, in not offering a *continuous series of writing courses of such a character that they will be taken fearlessly even by mediocre students*. Unfortunately, many of mediocre ability are destined to teach Latin under complacent or impoverished school boards, and even the most talented will soon be

guilty of impossible syntax and forms like *faciebitur* or *potabarentur*, if they cease using their knowledge. A language can not be learned once for all; power to speak or write it vanishes without constant practice. To illustrate this fact I have more than once experimented on similar groups of juniors or seniors. Those who have written no Latin since their freshman year require from three to five hours with the aid of grammar and dictionary to turn a simple passage based on Caesar into very bad Latin; others, equal in ability and extent of reading, who have had a weekly hour of composition, can translate the same piece at sight in twenty minutes, making about one-sixth as many mistakes. Even a 'C' student can learn to write decently without excessive effort, yet at present 'Latin prose' has so bad a name in many places that only the cleverest and most ambitious will take more than the minimum, while those who most need its training least often persevere till it ceases to be drudgery.

In what ways, then, can composition be made more popular as an elective with those who already like Latin? First of all, we must ourselves believe in it and lose no opportunity of explaining the reasons for our belief. Then we should make admission to the class an honor, carrying with it some privilege or exemption. We should promise to pass anyone whom we admit who will spend the required time according to our directions; we should agree to give good marks for effort and improvement regardless of the absolute standard attained. Finally, having ensnared our pupils, we must set tasks so well within their powers that praise can justly be given to the results of their labor. If, on the other hand, we demand four, six, or eight hours of preparation of an hour's credit and then mark severely by a Ciceronian standard, we can scarcely wonder at our present unpopularity. Easy lessons extending over two or three years are more profitable than unreasonably hard ones, followed by discouragement and cessation of effort after a single term. There is no danger that composition in any foreign language will be made too easy!

¹ Much of the following discussion naturally applies also to Greek, in which similar methods are, or may be, used.